

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:	PETERSON <i>et al.</i>	Examiner:	Edwards, Laura E.
Serial No.:	10/533,175	Group Art Unit:	1792
Filed:	April 29, 2005	Docket No.:	CWPL103US <i>Prior</i> (PETPCT1003)
Allowed:	October 30, 2008	Confirmation No.:	8992
Title:	AUTOMATIC VEHICLE WASH AND WAX SYSTEM		

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

MAIL STOP ISSUE FEE
c/o Technology Center 1700
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Customer No. 40581

Dear Sir:

The Examiner's statement for allowance could be construed to imply that the claimed invention was allowed because the references of record did not disclose certain aspects of the claimed invention. The characterized aspects, however, if indeed could be found in the prior art, would not render the claimed invention invalid under §102 because the claimed invention includes a number of other limitations. With respect to §103, the rigors of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness include not only showing that the prior art teaches the entire claimed invention (all limitations are to be considered), but also that combining the various prior art references is suggested in the art or that there would be motivation to make the combination. The reasons provided do not appear to be necessarily inconsistent herewith.

Page 2 of 2

Unless Applicant hears otherwise, Applicant's comments herein are, as intended,
clarifying in a manner consistent with the law.

Respectfully submitted,

CRAWFORD MAUNU PLLC
1150 Northland Drive, Suite 100
St. Paul, Minnesota 55120
(651) 686-6633

By: 

Eric J. Curtin

Reg. No.: 47,511